

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Pamela Dittmar,

Plaintiff

v.

City of North Las Vegas,

Defendant

Case No.: 2:17-cv-02916-JAD-PAL

**Order Granting in Part and Denying in  
Part Stipulation, Denying Motion to  
Dismiss Without Prejudice, and Vacating  
Hearing**

[ECF Nos. 8, 13]

Pamela Dittmar sues her former employer, the City of North Las Vegas, for discrimination, retaliation, tortious interference with an employment relationship, and negligent hiring, supervision, and retention.<sup>1</sup> The City moves to dismiss Dittmar's claims for intentional discrimination, tortious interference, and negligent hiring, supervision, and retention.<sup>2</sup> The dismissal motion is set to be heard on May 14, 2018.<sup>3</sup>

The parties now stipulate to stay briefing on the motion and vacate the hearing.<sup>4</sup> They explain that Dittmar has requested—but not yet received—a right-to-sue letter from the Nevada Equal Rights Commission (NERC) for a second charge of discrimination that she filed with the NERC about the City. Dittmar intends to amend her complaint to include this second charge once she receives the right-to-sue letter from the NERC. The City consents to Dittmar amending her complaint to include the second charge. The parties also explain that Dittmar and her

---

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 1.

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 8.

<sup>3</sup> ECF No. 9.

<sup>4</sup> ECF No. 13.

1 counsel are determining how to proceed with her fifth and sixth claims in light of the City's  
2 dismissal arguments.

3 My take away from this stipulation is that the parties have agreed that the landscape of  
4 this case will change—new claims will be added for the second charge of discrimination and two  
5 of Dittmar's current claims might be altered or abandoned. I appreciate that the parties have  
6 agreed to these changes and jointly recommend procedures to accommodate them. To ensure a  
7 clear record in this case, and because Dittmar's anticipated amendment might moot the City's  
8 dismissal motion,

9 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' stipulation [ECF No. 13] is **GRANTED in**  
10 **part and DENIED in part**: Dittmar must file her amended complaint within 30 days of  
11 receiving her right-to-sue letter from the NERC; the City's dismissal motion [ECF No. 8] is  
12 **DENIED without prejudice to the City's right to reurge it after Dittmar files her amended**  
13 **complaint**; and the May 14, 2018, hearing on the City's dismissal motion is **VACATED**.

14 Dated: April 24, 2018

15   
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey